- 1	
1	EDMUND G. BROWN JR.
2	Attorney General of California GLORIA A. BARRIOS
3	Supervising Deputy Attorney General MICHAEL BROWN
4	Deputy Attorney General State Bar No. 231237
5	300 So. Spring Street, Suite 1702 Los Angeles, CA 90013
6	Telephone: (213) 897-2095 Facsimile: (213) 897-2804
7	Attorneys for Complainant
8	BEFORE THE BOARD FOR PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS
9	DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA
10	
11	In the Matter of the Accusation Against: Case No. 890-A
12	WILLIAM HOWARD CURRY P.O. Box 1591
13	Big Bear Lake, CA 92315 Civil Engineer License No. C 24166 A C C U S A T I O N
14	Respondent.
15	
16	Complainant alleges:
17	PARTIES
18	1. David E. Brown (Complainant) brings this Accusation solely in his official capacity
19	as the Executive Officer of the Board for Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors,
20	Department of Consumer Affairs.
21	2. On or about June 12, 1974, the Board for Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors
22	issued Civil Engineer License Number C 24166 to William Howard Curry (Respondent). The
23	Civil Engineer License was in full force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought
24	herein and will expire on December 31, 2011, unless renewed.
25	JURISDICTION
26	3. This Accusation is brought before the Board for Professional Engineers and Land
27	Surveyors (Board), Department of Consumer Affairs, under the authority of the following laws.
28	All section references are to the Business and Professions Code unless otherwise indicated.
	· · ·

28 | ///

STATUTORY PROVISIONS

- 4. Section 118, subdivision (b), provides that the suspension, expiration, surrender, or cancellation shall not deprive the Board of jurisdiction to proceed with a disciplinary action during the period within which the license may be renewed, restored, reissued or reinstated.
- 5. Section 6775 of the Code states, in pertinent part, that "[T]he board may reprove, suspend for a period not to exceed two years, or revoke the certificate of any professional engineer registered under this chapter:

. . .

"(c) Who has been found guilty by the board of negligence or incompetence in his or her practice."

COST RECOVERY

6. Section 125.3 of the Code provides, in pertinent part, that the board may request the administrative law judge to direct a licentiate found to have committed a violation or violations of the licensing act to pay a sum not to exceed the reasonable costs of the investigation and enforcement of the case.

PULASKI PROJECT

7. On or about June 3, 2005, Respondent performed civil engineering consisting of a boundary survey, topographic survey, and grading plan, along with structural engineering on a new residence at 352 Pulaski Road, Big Bear Lake, California (Pulaski Project). Homeowner John Miller (Homeowner) hired Respondent especially to ensure that the deck height of the new residence would not exceed that of the original deck in order to comply with an agreement by Homeowner and neighboring property owners regarding preserving the view. Respondent did not complete the terms of the contract, despite many promises to do so and excuses for failing to keep those promises. After Homeowner terminated Respondent, Respondent's plans were submitted to the City of Big Bear Lake by a new engineer and were rejected. Respondent incorrectly designed the foundation points, which ultimately affected the height of the deck.

8. The Respondent departed from the standard of care that would be exercised by a
reasonably prudent professional engineer.
FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE
(Negligence and/or Incompetence in the Practice of Professional Engineering)
9. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under section 6775, subdivision (c) of the
Code, in that on the Pulaski Project, Respondent committed negligence, and/or, incompetence in
violation of the applicable standard of care, including, but not limited to:
a. Structural Calculations.
1) Respondent failed to define seismic loading criteria, use of approximated
distributed loading to lateral elements without clear justification, lack of
detailed design and detailing of the ordinary moment frames, and absence of
calculations of collector elements;
2) Respondent failed to consider the base shear coefficient as 0.264 (V=0.264W),
without showing how it is derived using Uniform Building Code section
1633.2.
3) Respondent failed to define the R value used in the determination of the base
shear;
4) Respondent failed to take into consideration the loading combinations outlined
in section 1612 in the Uniform Building Code;
5) Respondent failed to make conversion made to the strength level seismic loads
calculated using Uniform Building Code static approach, used in the ASD
method design of frames and their connections in the structure.
b. <u>Boundary Survey</u>
1) Respondent failed to include sufficient research of existing record maps or the
proper calculation and substantiation of found record monuments or the proper
substantiation of adjoining property lines;
111